

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 25, 2005, claims 33 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; claims 25, 27, 28, 31, 32, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,342,053 to Berry; claims 55 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the Berry reference; and claims 1, 25-32, 34-45, and 47-56 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-9 and 18-31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,623,476.

As indicated above, Applicants have canceled claims 33 and 36, incorporated the limitation of canceled claims 26 and 39 into claims 24 and 38, respectively, and rewritten claims 29, 30, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 51, and 52 in independent form. In addition, a Terminal Disclaimer is hereby submitted to overcome the rejection based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

In view of the above, Applicants assert that all claims of the present application are in a form suitable for allowance and such is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

DATE: June 27, 2005

By: 

David M. Morse
Reg. No. 50,505

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.
865 South Figueroa Street
Twenty-Ninth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017-2576
(213) 892-9200